

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 25 2004**

**SMART & BIGGAR**

*Intellectual Property & Technology Law*

P.O. Box 2999, Station D  
900 - 55 Metcalfe Street  
Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1P 5Y6  
Tel. (613) 232-2486 Fax (613) 232-8440  
www.smart-biggart.ca

Allan Brett  
abrett@smart-biggart.ca

**Our Ref: 77682-240**

August 25, 2004

Mr. Alexander O. Boakye  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
U.S.A.

**VIA FACSIMILE**

Dear Examiner Boakye:

Re: Canadian Patent Application  
No. 09/584,539  
Applicant: CARL F. CAO  
Inventor: Carl F. Cao

**TRANSMISSION CONTROL PROTOCOL HANDOFF**

**Topics for Discussion During Interview**

The Examiner has argued on page 2 of the Office Action that Gupta teaches "the wireless network notifying the transmitting host when the wireless receiving host is in handoff and when the wireless receiving host is not in handoff (page 187, second column, paragraph 3)".

This is how Gupta works: the mobile host sends multiple copies of negative acknowledgement (see column 186, paragraph 4). The purpose is to denote handoff completion, but there is no similar mechanism for indicating the start of a handoff.

The base station receives the duplicate acknowledgements. The duplicate acknowledgements trick the base station into sending an acknowledgement on to the TCP sender with the advertised window field set to zero. See column 186 under "B.2 Operation". This tricks the TCP sender into entering "persist mode" such that all states are frozen. The TCP sender leaves persist mode upon receipt of another acknowledgement having a new "latest advertised window". See the third paragraph of column 187.

OTTAWA MONTREAL TORONTO EDMONTON VANCOUVER

Our Ref: 77682-240

- 2 -

**SMART & BIGGAR**

None of this messaging informs the TCP sender that the wireless receiving host is in handoff or that the wireless receiving host is no longer in handoff as recited in Applicant's claim 1. In fact, column 186 of Gupta specifically states that "we propose to make the TCP sender unaware of the occurrence of the motion by freezing all its transmission timer and states. To do this, the BS is made to change the information in the TCP acknowledgements to make the sender interpret the event as a receivers buffer depletion".

On the basis of this, I would like to discuss with you and more particularly to receive a clear indication from you, of where in Gupta the particular step of "the wireless network notifying the transmitting host when the wireless receiving host is in handoff and when the wireless receiving host is no longer in handoff" is taught in Gupta as required for a proper 102 (e) rejection.

Yours very truly,

SMART &amp; BIGGAR

  
Allan BrettRAB:rd  
Encl.

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

6132328440

T-517 P.001/003 F-617

**AUG 25 2004**

---

## **SMART & BIGGAR**

*Intellectual Property & Technology Law*

**To Fax no.:** (703) 872-9306

**Page 1 of:** 3

**Attention:** Examiner Alexander Boakye

**From:** Allan Brett

**Your file no.:** 09/584,539

**Reply to Ottawa file no.:** 77682-240

P.O. Box 2999, Station D  
55 Metcalfe Street, Suite 900  
Ottawa, Canada K1P 5Y6

Tel.: (613) 232-2486

Fax: (613) 232-8440

**Date:** August 25, 2004

**Time:** --

---

---

**If there are any transmission problems, please call (613) 232-2486.**

Original copy and any enclosures

☐ will

☒ will not

be sent by

☒ mail

☒ courier

The information contained in this transmission is confidential and only for the intended recipient identified above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or use of this communication is unlawful. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (collect). Return the original message to us and retain no copy.